

CALIFORNIA-NEVADA TAHOE BASIN FIRE COMMISSION

SUMMARY MINUTES of the meeting of February 8, 2008

Sierra Nevada College
Incline Village, Nevada

1. Call to order and Roll Call

Co-chair Mr. Rogich called the meeting to order at approximately 9:00 a.m.

A roll call was made:

Members Present:

Commissioners Rogich, Anderson, Brown, Hicks, Koster, McIntyre, Michael, Peña, Pickett, Santini, Upton, Patrick Wright, James Wright, Ex-Officio Members Biaggi, Drozdoff.

Members Absent: Commissioners Dargan, Davidson, Grijalva, Tuck, Ex-Officio Member Horne.

(During the meeting Co-chair Dargan and Commissioners Grijalva and Tuck joined the meeting. The time of their arrival for the record of votes on action items is noted in the minutes).

Mr. Rogich now moved down the agenda to:

2. Discussion and Adoption of Minutes-Action

A. January 15, 2008

B. January 25, 2008

Dana Cole of the Commission staff noted that the members had received the minutes of January 15 at the last meeting, but the minutes of January 25 had just been distributed today. Mr. Rogich asked for a motion for approval of the minutes of January 15. Mr. Upton said he had one change; on page 9, lines 3-4 the word "cover" should be "coverage." The change was noted by staff.

Motion: Mr. Upton moved that the minutes of the meeting of January 15 be adopted as amended, he was seconded by Mr. Hicks, and the vote was unanimous in favor.

Mr. Rogich noted that the minutes of January 25 would be considered at the next Commission meeting.

Mr. Rogich now moved down the agenda to:

3. Staff Report—Discussion/Action

A. Status of Proposed Findings and Recommendations

B. Remaining Meeting

C. Amendment to Commission Bylaws Regarding Committees

C. Amendment to Commission Bylaws Regarding Committees

Mr. Cole asked the Chair if 3. C. could be taken first, and Mr. Rogich approved. Mr. Cole note that with the limited number of committee meetings possible in the future and the volume of work to be done it was critical to have a quorum at each meeting for the purpose of approving Findings and Recommendations (F&Rs) and other committee actions. The proposal at the last meeting of adding alternate members to the committees in order to assist in this had been placed on the agenda for action today. He asked Christine Sproul, Counsel to the Committee from the California Attorney General's office to address the Commission on the matter.

Ms. Sproul stated that it was within the Commission's discretion to amend the bylaws through a properly noticed agenda item and said that Mr. Cole had covered the main points; adding alternates to the committees would not raise the number of members needed for a quorum. She recommended that there first be a vote to amend the bylaws as agendized, and then name the new alternates thorough a second vote.

Motion: Mr. Santini moved that the language appearing on the agenda under 3.C. be approved, and Mr. Brown seconded. The vote was unanimous in favor.

After a brief discussion and call for volunteers Mr. Hicks, Mr. Pickett and Mr. McIntyre were identified as alternates to the Wildland Fuels Committee, and Mr. Peña, Mr. Biaggi and Mr. Anderson as alternates to the Community Fire Safety Committee.

Motion: it was moved by Mr. Santini that these names be accepted as alternates to the committees named, and Mr. Peña seconded. The vote was unanimous in favor.

At this point Dr. Robert Maxson, President of Sierra Nevada College, was recognized by Mr. Rogich and came forward to welcome the Commission to the campus. He praised the firefighting profession and noted that the building the meeting was being held in was an innovative design and exceptionally environmentally friendly.

Commissioner Cindy Tuck joined the meeting at this point and was present for votes on succeeding motions.

Mr. Rogich now moved down the agenda to:

A. Status of Proposed Findings and Recommendations

Mr. Cole said he would be referring to the document that was adopted by the Commission at the December 14 meeting on the process for developing F&Rs. He said copies were being circulated to the Commissioners and available to the public in the room, and also on the Commission website.

He continued: There are currently 77 F&Rs referred to the Commission, 44 have been on committee agendas so far, so there are 33 still to be reviewed by committees, plus additional F&Rs are coming in every day "at an accelerating rate." Friday, Feb. 15 at 5 p.m. is the announced deadline for submittal. He added that at the next committee meetings on Feb. 19 he expected from 10 to 20 new F&Rs for each committee to look at.

Since each committee has a growing number of F&Rs in addition to the ones already considered, he said it was an important workload issue because the Commission is scheduled to adopt all F&Rs by the end of the meeting of March 7, leaving time to complete the final report for the March 21 meeting.

He went over some points in the document—that the process was designed so that *anyone* could submit an F&R, and a large variety of people had including Commissioners, fire chiefs, members of various groups and the general public etc. This had also resulted in the large number of submissions. These submissions were supposed to go through Mr. Cole to be logged, tracked and posted on the public website, but some had been brought in by people and presented for the first time at committee meetings etc. Mr. Cole and staff are making every effort to get these into the process but since these are not in the proper form it causes difficulties.

He also noted that many F&Rs now being submitted are near duplicates of existing ones in the *Finding* portion, but have different or even opposed *Recommendations*. He added that committees are not *required* to hear and vote on all F&Rs, and that committees will need to make decisions on what findings to consider and what the committee's exact recommendation will be.

Mr. McIntyre spoke of putting all the F&Rs on the committee agendas to make sure that they can be considered, merged and otherwise processed; Mr. Cole noted that this is being done, but that F&Rs that arrive within 10 days before

the meetings cannot be legally agendized. Also, they're being agendized in a somewhat generic way.

Ms. Sproul came forward to note that she and other counsel (Robert Kilroy) and staff (Josh Hicks) have decided and advise that it is proper notice to agendize general categories or subjects and list each finding under that. All the individual items need to be available to the committee and the public.

Mr. Hicks added that as indicated many of the F&Rs have similar themes or concepts, and he wondered if there was a restriction in using or synthesizing a similar F&R and incorporating it with one that is on the agenda. Ms. Sproul replied that she didn't see a problem under the general category. Mr. Cole added that under the category on an agenda, the committee can consider it but it must arrive a reasonable time before the meeting if copies for the public are to be provided, so F&Rs submitted just before a meeting are not practical.

Mr. Hicks asked about finding unagendized F&Rs on the website, and Mr. Cole said that yes, all submissions are posted but must be sent electronically and submitted to the web master. Dropping off a paper copy at a meeting won't allow for posting. Mr. Hicks noted that he had found the website very helpful. Mr. Cole said that all 63 F&Rs in the spreadsheet in the packet were posted. He added that the workload in receiving, processing, logging, posting etc. for these was staggering—and after Feb. 15 he expects it to stop unless the Commission decides otherwise.

Mr. Rogich said that this was correct. He added that people were getting used to the system, website, etc. Mr. Cole also noted that this process was the most open possible for the kind of task the Commission was doing, everyone and anyone could have input, and he thought this was very positive.

Mr. Rogich now moved down the agenda to:

B. Remaining Meetings

Mr. Cole noted the next meeting was Feb. 19 and that notice requirements dictated that the agenda was being prepared even as today's meeting was going on. The 19th will be a one-day meeting, due to the major workshop going on Feb. 20. So, on the 19th the Wildland Fuel and Fire Safety Committees will meet from approximately 9 a.m. until noon, the Legislative and Funding Policy Committee from 1 to 3 p.m. and the full Commission from approximately 3 to 5 p.m.. He warned that there will definitely be a number of F&Rs on the Commission agenda.

Following that there will be a meeting March 6-7, and according to the work plan at that point 100 percent of F&Rs will be delivered by the committees. The Commission may not have time on March 7 to act on all of them, but otherwise the last chance is March 20-21 and the final report is due on the 21st.

Mr. Rogich wondered about an additional meeting—Mr. Cole said that it could be done but there were potential logistical problems if the meeting wasn't scheduled soon. Mr. Koster said that he was prepared to make meeting space at Harrah's or Harvey's available if needed. Mr. Upton wondered about the schedule for March 20, would there be committees that day or just the Commission. Mr. Cole hoped that the committees would be done as noted in the work plan and that both days would be available for the Commission to consider the (large) number of F&Rs that would be on the agenda. So he would like to see all the F&Rs done by committees March 6, the staff would clean up, organize and send a binder to Commission members to go through at the meeting of the 20th-21st. The plan is to consider the F&Rs in subject groups, with several in a group, have discussion and public comment on the group and vote on them as a group unless there was objection on one of them.

Mr. Koster emphasized prioritizing the remaining F&Rs, dealing with the most important first. Mr. Upton also emphasized that the report to the governors should have an emphasis on what the most important actions are.

There was no public comment on the report.

Motion: Mr. Hicks moved that the staff report be accepted, he was seconded by Mr. Upton, and the vote was unanimous in favor.

(Commissioner Grijalva now joined the meeting)

Mr. Rogich now moved down the agenda to:

4. Report by Brett Storey. Placer County Executive Office, on the Tahoe Biomass Facility Assessment - Discussion

Mr. Cole introduced Mr. Storey and noted that an F&R on the subject of biomass would be heard at the next meeting. Mr. Rogich said that he intended that the Commission include an F&R for an accelerated depreciation schedule to encourage business to invest in biomass. He added that economic and tax help was needed, on the model that was used by government to encourage other industries, including a federal component.

Mr. Storey gave a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was distributed to the Commission. He was joined for the presentation by Thad Mason and Fred

Tornator of TSS Consultants, a firm specializing in the evaluation of feasibility of biomass projects.

Mr. Storey noted that the proposed thinning in the Tahoe Basin would produce a considerable volume of low-value woody biomass. The Forest Service and Placer County have funded a feasibility study of a wood to biomass energy facility in the Basin, specifically in Placer County.

It would be a "public-private" facility and the proposal is for a plant to be operative in the 2010-12 timeframe.

Fred Tornator of TSS went over some of the fuel type and accessibility requirements for a feasible facility. Sources for this project would include forest fuel treatment residuals, defensible space biomass thinnings and some timber harvest residuals from public and private lands.

For the Burton Creek project in Placer County the project would be scales at 1 to 3 megawatts and utilize between 3,000 and 24,000 tons of fuels per year. This would be 2 to 6 truckloads per day.

Mr. Rogich asked if the ten-year plan that the Commission has seen and referenced previously was in line with these requirements? Mr. Storey replied that he could not answer definitively, but this project would be looking at a 25-mile radius of the plant, not the entire Basin and there were studies that said the plant would not be able to use up the entire quantity of material in this radius. The facility is being sized for a 20-plus year time frame; after 10 years there could be less supply. Mr. Rogich asked if it made sense, for example, to look at a 2 to 6 megawatt facility. Mr. Storey replied that by May they would have more information to gauge the capacity, and it could go larger if that was desired.

Mr. Tornator noted that air quality issues also have an impact on sizing the plant. He exhibited comparisons of emissions that showed dramatically lower emissions from controlled combustion of material (biomass plant), versus wildfire or pile burning.

He concluded that they feel that the biomass plant is a viable solution in the Basin and that his organization was concentrating on evaluating various technologies. The emphasis is on very low emission systems. They are looking at up to 20 vendors. Various types of systems will be evaluated that must be compatible with the special air quality issues, land use constraints, water use etc.

After these parameters are determined they will develop a "technology matrix" and vendors will be queried on technology requirements and costs. He showed an example in a spreadsheet of the evaluation matrix.

After an evaluation and analysis of project implications and technology recommendation will be produced in a working document.

Mr. Storey noted that this document should be available by May or June of this year, would then be reviewed by government agencies and the public, and then there will be a decision point on going ahead with the project, if yes, then an RFP would be prepared to solicit bids for building the project. The Burton Creek Justice Center is being rebuilt, and the plant would be collocated there. Sierra Pacific would be the plant operating partner.

He discussed financing: From beginning to end including scoping and evaluation, through construction he projected a \$10 million project, so far about \$7 million has been defined, including a Congressional earmark this fiscal year to pay for analysis. Operational capability would be in the 2010-12 time frame, coinciding with the operational date for the new Justice Center. The money from private sources is for building the plant only. He said he expected to have a complete business plan by the end of 2008.

Mr. McIntyre asked about other forests in the area and asked if it didn't make more sense to site the facility more centrally (e.g. Cabin Creek) rather than at the proposed location? Mr. Storey replied that there were air permit issues outside of the Basin, the county is in non-attainment with ozone levels. They are working with EPA on doing a demonstration project outside the basin, but because of the law a stationary source currently can't be built in those locations. He said that material may be stored at Cabin Creek and brought in by smaller trucks at low traffic times.

Mr. Rogich asked what the hold-up was on the permit. Mr. Storey said that he needed all the homework, the science and math that will show the offsets. He needs to receive further funds to complete the work.

Ms. Tuck asked about the location of the site and whether the offsets were available, and Mr. Storey reiterated that they were, but work on showing them is still in progress. Ms. Tuck said that was good, she noted that in many areas of California offsets are not available and that makes it very difficult to site a project like this.

Mr. Tornator added that at the 1 to 3 megawatt level he felt they might stay below the level where offsets were actually needed, or perhaps only very few

would be necessary. He also noted that the collocation at the Justice Center and use of heat for structures added to making it a feasible project.

Mr. Rogich asked what Mr. Storey would like the Commission to do specifically, and Mr. Storey replied, to address the biomass F&Rs, that they were a good set and that would help move the project along, they would like to push forward and build as quickly as they could.

Mr. Rogich now moved down the agenda to:

5. Committee Reports

A. Wildland Fuels Committee

Mr. Peña gave the report, noting that yesterday the committee was able to cover all agenda items, take action and forward 12 F&Rs and reviewed 13 permit streamlining F&Rs that they look forward to taking action on at the next committee meeting. The 12 forwarded F&Rs should all be before the full Commission for action on Feb. 19.

In particular, he thought the air quality F&Rs would give more flexibility to get fuels treatment work done in the Basin, plus the process served as a catalyst to bring together the regulators and the implementers more completely than they have in the past, which will facilitate future actions.

Mr. Rogich asked if the committee had "specific burn times" and Mr. Peña said that expanded burn days had specific recommendations that were adopted, as well as increased monitoring to validate the case for more burn days available.

Mr. Peña continued by saying that biomass and fuels treatment F&Rs had progressed and they would be getting that accomplished at the next meeting.

Mr. Rogich asked about differing standards in Nevada and California in regard to burn days, that in Nevada there is more latitude; Mr. Peña said that in the discussion from an air quality standpoint they were careful to maintain the benefits Nevada provides and try to move California, within the legal framework available, closer to the opportunity Nevada provides.

Mr. Peña identified a strategy for dealing with the flood of new F&Rs. His committee will sort and then ask: Has it already been addressed? If new, does it add value to the discussion? Does it fit in the areas we identified that the committee was going to address?

Mr. Drozdoff asked for a brief listing of the 12 F&Rs that were approved, and Mr. Peña said he would just list by number (Commissioners referred to their spreadsheets): Nos. 7, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 8 (modified, acted on air quality portion), 1, 32, 29, 12, 20, 15, and 16 was merged with a fuel and biomass finding. Three recommendations in 16 were handed off to the Legislative and Funding Policy Committee.

Mr. Cole wanted to point out (to the other committees) that in regard to F&R 7, the committee had approved the priorities of "life, safety, environment" in that order, something that could be included in other F&Rs as well; but it was already going to be before the Commission in this one.

Mr. Upton commented on the process of crafting the language in the final approved F&Rs, noting that they received public testimony and went over everything carefully, and the language is now very specific.

Mr. Patrick Wright said that at the agency level they would work to integrate and synthesize these findings; for instance, the permit streamlining working group has received a whole series of recommendations that are overlapping and redundant; he and the group didn't want the governors and public to get a large number of findings that differ only by a paragraph. He liked the idea of voting on a group or set of F&Rs. He noted that due to time constraints he hoped people would realize that F&Rs that came in at the end of the time frame might not be voted on *individually*, but they would all be *considered*.

Ms. Tuck added that this was a really good idea, that if overlapping F&Rs came to the governors they would pass them to agencies for implementation, so it was important that the Commission does the (synthesizing) work up front.

Mr. Peña said that his committee is doing this up front, but that a challenge that Mr. Wright had pointed out, was if the Commission was going to bring forward F&Rs that haven't been vetted by state agencies. And the answer was, probably, because there is not time to delay and make sure everyone is comfortable with the F&Rs. So they are making sure to eliminate redundancies rather than make sure everyone is comfortable, because there are frankly differences of opinion between committee members and between the committee and agency people. If something is aligned with the wishes of the committee, that's where they're going to take it. Everything will not have universal support. After the 19th they will not be able to entertain more changes. Until then, if something adds value it will be considered and possibly worked into an existing F&R.

Mr. Grijalva said his committee was having the same issue, and said that also included federal agencies; he added what he felt was an important point, that

if there are any inconsistencies between recommendations they need to be resolved by the Commission; the governors shouldn't receive any conflicting recommendation.

Mr. Rogich agreed, and added that another important factor was the differences between the rules in the two states. He said that the goal would be to come to consensus but that one state should not, necessarily, be held to the standards of the other.

Mr. Pena continued by saying the between February 15 and March 22, 2008 the committee will continue to work hard to come to agreement on the outstanding issues. He feels that his responsibility and that of the committee is to make recommendations that can be implemented.

Mr. Rogich pointed out that the Commission has been classified as an emergency entity body and as such the Governors of California and Nevada actions reach a level of executive authority.

Commissioner John Koster said that it is important to recognize that all stakeholders may not agree with all recommendations. Mr. Rogich said that the Commission has agreed that the priorities are life, property, and environment in that order of priority.

Motion: Chairman Rogich moved that the report of the Wildland Fuels Committee. The motion was seconded and the vote was unanimous in favor.

Commissioner Ruben Grijalva offered a report of the Community Fire Safety Committee. He said that the committee reviewed a number of Findings and Recommendations. They modified the language on three findings and took action on seven. Four F&Rs were tabled and will be considered or covered in other findings.

The committee heard presentations from the Lake Tahoe Fire Chiefs, the Tahoe City Public Utilities District, and the South Tahoe Public Utilities District on the subject of water supply during the Angora Fire. The discussion included information on a 20 year upgrade to the system, issues concerning construction and pressure of water.

Action was taken on five agenda items: F&R #10 concerning project streamlining, #11 concerning level of protection, which was accepted without amendment. The purpose of this F&R is to enhance communication between the various dispatch centers. Mr. Rogich said that when we ask Congress for funding it is important that we are able to demonstrate efficiencies and that the Commission should keep this in mind.

Mr. Grijalva continued with discussion of F&R numbers 13 and 14 relating to public education and the film industry. No action was taken though the F&Rs will be forwarded to the Commission. F&R # 17 relating to defensible space was accepted by the committee with some revised wording. The working groups will continue to work toward consensus on this subject. There was general agreement that if the assembled experts cannot agree to a clear standard of what can be maintained or removed within 30 feet of any structure by the time this Commission terminates then property owners should be permitted by all responsible authorities to remove any and all flammable materials, vegetation, and combustibles (to include pine needles and wood mulch) around structures for areas up to 30 feet.

Items that will be discussed at the next meeting are F&R #17, 56, 57, 58, and 63. F&R 57 relates to a request for modular air firefighting units for the NV Air National Guard. F&R #57 relates to Public Resources Code 4129 and protection of SRA. F&R #58 relates to putting a Cal Fire station in the Lake Tahoe Basin, possibly in a state park. F&R #63 relates to public education and a document entitled "Living with Fire."

Motion: To accept the report from the Community Fire Safety Committee. The motion was seconded and the vote was unanimous in favor.

Dana Cole mentioned that the Commission was expecting a presentation from a representative of the BLM to discuss the SNPLMA grant process, but that she has not yet checked in with staff. He also noted that Commission Co-chair Kate Dargan has been delayed because she is with her son who has recently returned from a 15 month tour of duty in Iraq.

Mr. Rogich continued with a report from the Legislative and Funding Policy Committee. He said that the findings will be grouped under three sub-heads, Emergency Declaration, Governance issues, and Funding. Commissioner Bud Hicks, who is a member of the committee, continued with a report. He said that they did not go through specific F&Rs but discussed the focus of the committee and some general concepts. Mr. Rogich said that the thinking is that the TRPA compact may or may not be reopened but that there will be discussion of changing the responsibilities of the group. It is possible that some responsibilities will be taken away as opposed to adding to the TRPA compact. He said that a specific plan will be forth coming. The Committee continued with a discussion of redundancies in permitting, a review of all of the duties that the TRPA performs, expansion of the TRPA board, changes in some of the membership components of the board.

Commissioner Cindy Tuck asked if the F&Rs that are currently considered by the Committee are available to all Commissioners. Mr. Cole said yes that they are listed on the spreadsheet and are available to everyone on the Commission website.

Mr. Hicks continued with an update of the F&Rs being concerned by the Legislative and Funding Policy Committee, #16, 18, 19, 52, 53, 61, and 62. He said that #16, 18, 19, and 61 may be incorporated with other F&Rs. Commissioner Leo Drozdoff pointed out the fact that some of the F&Rs may be implemented before the Commission ends its work and that it would be important to discuss the process.

Mr. Cole said that the spreadsheet will be adjusted to include information concerning F&Rs that have been implemented. Mr. Hicks asked that staff might offer some sample language and that the final report reflect the progress that has been made even before the Commission has completed its meetings. Mr. Cole said that the plans for the final report include categorizing the work in broad subject areas, i.e. permitting, air quality, etc. There is also a plan for including accomplishments in the report.

Mr. Koster stressed the importance of working to resolve and to implement recommendations before the beginning of the next fire season. There was general agreement.

Motion: Mr. Rogich moved to accept the minutes of the Legislative and Funding Policy Committee. The motion was seconded and the vote was unanimous in favor.

(Commission Co-chair Kate Dargan now joined the meeting.)

6. Working Group Report

Steve Chilton, Chief of the Environmental Improvement branch of the TRPA, reported for Mike Vollmer who is organizing a SEZ workshop and was not able to attend the meeting today.

Mr. Chilton reported on a three day retreat that was recently held. It was an Interagency Planning Information Team (IPIT) and the focus was on putting together requests for Round 8 SNPLMA funding for private and some public agencies. He said that a great deal was accomplished and that many projects are on track for implementation this summer. They worked through some strategic and operational planning, and some organizing for implementation. They discussed a workshop for contractors in April, 2008. The focus of the workshop is to assist contractors in understanding defensible space and to be

sure that all involved are on the same page. The group also discussed future funding opportunities through SNMPLA.

Mr. Pickett attended the workshop and said that one of the charges of the funding committee is to put together a business plan and to formalize what the business plan would look like. They identified funding gaps in the operational model but recognized that if there was an attempt to fill the gaps through the SNPLMA requests it may result in a loss of competitiveness. The goal is to hold these workshops on an annual basis and to agree upon projects and funding requests each year.

Commission Chair Kate Dargan asked about the funding gaps that may be complicating the process and delaying projects. Mr. Pickett said that the BLM has said that it will be important to demonstrate results between May 1 and June 1 of this year. Human resources are available but the real need is for an accounting information system. At this point his group doesn't have resources for a much needed data base system that can accurately track and report projects and progress in the basin. This is essential in helping with grant request and in sharing information with the public. Another pressing need is funding for work that needs to be begun in the WUI. These projects need to start soon, by May 1 in order that they may be completed during the season.

Cathy Murphy continued discussion of the Working Groups' Report and said that the Air Quality and Bio-mass Working Groups have been working with state agencies such as the California Air Resources Board, Nevada air regulators, El Dorado and Placer Counties, and business and environmental groups. She said that there has been a great deal of dialog and success in working together. She stressed the fact that the Wildland Fuels Committee continues to reach out and to encourage representation from all interested parties.

7. Public Comments

Jennifer Quashnick of the Sierra Forest Legacy brought forth some edits that her group had asked be included in F&Rs that were considered during the committee meetings the on January 24, 2008. She said that the committees did not agree and that her group requests that they be removed from the membership list. She continued by saying that three conservation organizations worked together to review all of the F&Rs that have been submitted and discussed yesterday and they have submitted a letter outlining their recommendations. The letter is available to the public on a table outside the meeting room and will be made available to the Commissioners. Highlights of the letter include an outline of inaccurate statements and suggested

corrections, discussions of some F&Rs and outlines of alternatives, and a discussion of the importance of maintaining Lake Tahoe's special protections while also meeting fuel reduction needs. She said that these goals are not mutually exclusive. She said that many of the F&Rs will adversely affect funding for Lake Tahoe and that homeowners actions are being given less attention than tree cutting though it is more important. She continued by saying that her group still has concerns with most of the issues that were endorsed yesterday, but that she hopes that the Commission will continue to work to address the needs of the 1000s of people whom they represent. She concluded by saying that she hopes the Commission will use this process to seek creative solutions that actually address real problems rather than as a means to relax or remove environmental protections which may have limited effectiveness. Her group is developing F&Rs which will be submitted soon.

No other public comments were offered.

8. Adjournment

Commission Co-Chair adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:05 am.